UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/812,668 | 03/30/2004 | Branson W. Ritchie | UGRF123806 | 3574 |
| 26389 7590 08/15/2008 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | YOUNG, MICAH PAUL | |
| SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| , | | | 1618 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/15/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/812,668 | RITCHIE ET AL. | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | WII 67 (11 1 7 (6) 2 1 6 6 1 4 6 | 1818 |
|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>20 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (le | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection. |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the size forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett | sideration and/or search (see NO¯ v); | ΓE below); |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allownon-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, | timely filed amendment canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | l be entered and an explanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fails to provide a ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been conside because: See Continuation Sheet. | | • |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | |
| /Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618 | /MICAH-PAUL YOUNG Examiner, Art Unit 1618 | |
| | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

the combination of the prior art discloses a skin cleaning composition comprising each of the claimed components. The combination provides a composition comprising a chelating agent, a volume of cocamidopropyl; betaine and an antimicrobial agent. Applicant argues that the combination does not provide each of the specific concentrations of the instant claims; however the instant claims recite wide concentrations ranges. The claims recite components present in concentrations "from about 1-20% and from about 1-250 mM for the surfactant and chelating agent respectively. These ranges though not expressly disclosed in the prior art are wide enough to encompass the concentrations disclosed. Further the function of these concentrations is to enhance the antimicrobial agent. This function is maintained since the Mulder patent provides an enhanced skin disinfectant composition with each of the claimed components. The supporting references provide the specific surfactant and active agents, and establish that it would have been obvious to combine those components into a cleansing formulation.

/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618